UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

COPY MAILED

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

NOV 1 2 2008 OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of

Erez Bashan, et. al.

Application No. 10/783,472

Filed: February 20, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 40006985-0001-002

DECISION ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed July 22, 2008, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the Non-Final Office Action mailed, August 7, 2007, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three (3) months. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a) were obtained. Accordingly, the application became abandoned on November 8, 2007.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of an Amendment, (2) the petition fee of \$770, and (3) a proper statement of unintentional delay.

There is no indication that the person signing the petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. However, in accordance with 37CFR 1.34(a), the signature of Oren Reches appearing on the petition shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that he is authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he acts. If petitioner desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted.

It is not apparent whether the statement of unintentional delay was signed by a person who would have been in a position of knowing that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. Nevertheless, in accordance with 37 CFR 10.18, the statement is accepted as constituting a certification of unintentional delay. However, in the event that petitioner has no knowledge that the delay was unintentional, petitioner must make such an inquiry to ascertain that, in fact, the delay was unintentional. If petitioner discovers that the delay was intentional, petitioner must so notify the Office.

A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the address of record.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Denise Williams at (571) 272-8930.

This application is being referred to Technology Center AU 2619 for appropriate action by the Examiner in the normal course of business on the reply received.

Peritions Examiner
Office of Petitions

cc: Oren Reches Suite 100, North Union Street Alexandria, VA 22314